arXiv:1301.3799v1 [math.PR] 16 Jan 2013

A LEVY-AREA BETWEEN BROWNIAN MOTION AND ROUGH PATHS WITH APPLICATIONS TO ROBUST NON-LINEAR FILTERING AND RPDES

JOSCHA DIEHL AND HARALD OBERHAUSER

Abstract. We give meaning to differential equations with a rough path term and a Brownian noise term, that is we are interested in differential equations of the type

$$S_t^{\boldsymbol{\eta}} = S_0 + \int_0^t a\left(S_r^{\boldsymbol{\eta}}\right) dr + \int_0^t b\left(S_r^{\boldsymbol{\eta}}\right) \circ dB_r + \int_0^t c\left(S_r^{\boldsymbol{\eta}}\right) d\boldsymbol{\eta}_r$$

where $\boldsymbol{\eta}$ is a deterministic geometric, step-2 rough path and B is a multi-dimensional Brownian motion. Such differential equations as well as the question of regularity of the map $\boldsymbol{\eta} \mapsto S^{\boldsymbol{\eta}}$ arise naturally and we discuss two applications: one revisits Clark's robustness problem in nonlinear filtering, the other is a Feynman–Kac type representation of linear RPDEs .

1. Introduction

This article gives meaning to differential equations of the type

$$S_t^{\boldsymbol{\eta}} = S_0 + \int_0^t a\left(S_r^{\boldsymbol{\eta}}\right) dr + \int_0^t b\left(S_r^{\boldsymbol{\eta}}\right) \circ dB_r + \int_0^t c\left(S_r^{\boldsymbol{\eta}}\right) d\boldsymbol{\eta}_r, \tag{1.1}$$

that is, for a deterministic, step 2-rough path $\boldsymbol{\eta}$ we are looking for a stochastic process $S^{\boldsymbol{\eta}}$ that is adapted to $\sigma(B)$ and study the regularity of the map $\boldsymbol{\eta} \mapsto S^{\boldsymbol{\eta}}$. If either $b \equiv 0$ or $c \equiv 0$ then rough path theory [23, 24, 26, 16, 15] or standard Ito-calculus allow (under appropiate regularity assumptions on the vector fields (a, b, c)) to give meaning to such an equation. However, in the generic case when the vector fields b and c have a non-trivial Lie bracket, any notion of a solution (that is consistent with an Ito–Stratonovich calculus) must take into account the area swept out between the trajectories of B and $\boldsymbol{\eta}$. A natural approach is to identify $S^{\boldsymbol{\eta}}$ as the the RDE solution of

$$S_t = S_0 + \int_0^t (a, b, c)\left(S_r\right) d\left(r, \boldsymbol{\Lambda}_r\right) \tag{1.2}$$

where $\boldsymbol{\Lambda}$ is a joint, step-2 rough path lift between the enhanced Brownian motion $\boldsymbol{B} = \left(1 + B + \int B \otimes \circ dB\right)$ and $\boldsymbol{\eta}$, and $(r, \boldsymbol{\Lambda})$ is the joint rough path between the random rough path $\boldsymbol{\Lambda}$ and the bounded variation path $r \mapsto r$. While the existence of a joint lift between a continuous bounded variation path and any rough path is trivial (via integration by parts), the existence of a joint lift between two given step-2 rough paths is more subtle and in

---

Key words and phrases. Extension theorem for rough paths, Rough and stochastic differential equations, Clark's robustness problem in nonlinear filtering, Viscosity solutions of RPDEs.

general not possible. More precisely, let $\alpha \in \left(\frac{1}{3}, \frac{1}{2}\right)$ and denote with $\mathcal{C}^{0,\alpha}\left(\mathbb{R}^d\right)$ the space of geometric, step-2, α-Hölder rough paths over $\mathbb{R}^d$ (we often only write $\mathcal{C}^{0,\alpha}$ and d is chosen according to context). Fix two geometric, step-2 rough paths $\boldsymbol{\eta} = \left(1 + \boldsymbol{\eta}^1 + \boldsymbol{\eta}^2\right) \in \mathcal{C}^{0,\alpha}\left(\mathbb{R}^d\right)$, $\boldsymbol{b} = \left(1 + \boldsymbol{b}^1 + \boldsymbol{b}^2\right) \in \mathcal{C}^{0,\alpha}\left(\mathbb{R}^e\right)$. In general, one cannot hope to find a joint rough path lift, i.e. a geometric rough path $\boldsymbol{\lambda} = \left(1 + \boldsymbol{\lambda}^1 + \boldsymbol{\lambda}^2\right) \in \mathcal{C}^{0,\alpha}\left(\mathbb{R}^{d+e}\right)$ such that (formally)

$$\boldsymbol{\lambda}^1 = \left(\boldsymbol{\eta}^1, \boldsymbol{b}^1\right) \text{ and } \boldsymbol{\lambda}^2 = \begin{pmatrix} \boldsymbol{\eta}^2 & \int \eta \otimes db \\ \int b \otimes d\eta & \boldsymbol{b}^2 \end{pmatrix}$$

since the entries on the cross–diagonal of $\boldsymbol{\lambda}^2$ are not well–defined. (What is guaranteed by the extension theorem in [25] is that there exists a weak geometric rough path $\overline{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}$ such that $\overline{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}^1 = \left(\boldsymbol{\eta}^1, \boldsymbol{b}^1\right)$, however this $\overline{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}$ is highly non-unique and no consistency with $\boldsymbol{\eta}$ or $\boldsymbol{b}$ on the second level is guaranteed). In Section 2 we show that in the case when the deterministic rough path $\boldsymbol{b}$ is replaced by enhanced Brownian motion $\boldsymbol{B}$, there does indeed exists a stochastic process $\boldsymbol{\Lambda}$ which merits in a certain sense to be called the "canonical joint lift" of $\boldsymbol{\eta}$ and B. In Section 3 we use this lift $\boldsymbol{\Lambda}$ to give meaning to differential equations (1.1) resp. (1.2) and establish local Lipschitzness of the solution map $\boldsymbol{\eta} \mapsto S^{\boldsymbol{\eta}}$ from the space of geometric rough paths equipped with Hölder metric into the space of stochastic processes adapted to the Brownian filtration equipped with the topology of uniform convergence in $L^q(\Omega)$-norm. This is exactly the type of robustness we are interested in and finally allows us to turn to our initial motivation: differential equations of the form (1.1) naturally arise in certain robustness problems and in Section 4 we give two such applications. One revisits Clark's robustness problem in nonlinear filtering and provides an alternative to the recent approach via flow decomposition carried out in [7] which ultimately leads to a different set of regularity requirements on the vector fields, the other one is a Feynman–Kac represenation of solutions of PDEs with linear rough path noise.

Acknowledgement 1. Both authors are grateful for support from the European Research Council under the European Union's Seventh Framework Programme (FP7/2007–2013)/ERC grant agreement nr. 258237 and DFG Grant SPP-1324. Further, the authors would like to thank Dan Crisan and Peter Friz for helpful conversations. The proof of Lemma 14 in the appendix is based on an idea of Thomas Cass and Terry Lyons and found in their forthcoming work [6].

2. The joint lift

As usual we denote with Lip^{γ} the set of γ-Lipschitz functions $a : \mathbb{R}^{d_1} \to \mathbb{R}^{d_2}$ in the sense of E. Stein[1] where d_1 and d_2 are chosen according to the context. $G_d^2 \cong \mathbb{R}^d \oplus so(d)$ is the free nilpotent group[2] of step 2 over $\mathbb{R}^d$. We equip the space of geometric rough paths

---

[1] That is bounded k-th derivative for $k = 0, \ldots, \lfloor\gamma\rfloor$ and $(\gamma - \lfloor\gamma\rfloor)$-Hölder continuous $\lfloor\gamma\rfloor$-th derivative, where $\lfloor\gamma\rfloor$ is the largest integer strictly smaller then γ.

[2] This is the correct state space for a geometric $1/p$-Hölder rough path; the space of such paths subject to $1/p$-Hölder regularity (in rough path sense) yields a complete metric space under $1/p$-Hölder rough path metric. Technical details of geometric rough path spaces can be found e.g. in Section 9 of [15].

$\mathcal{C}^{0,\alpha}$ with the non-homogeneous metric $\rho_{\alpha-H\ddot{o}l}$ which makes it a Polish space and denote the associated non-homogenous norm[3] on this non-linear space with $\|.\|_{\alpha-H\ddot{o}l}$, (similarly we denote the non-separable space of weak geometric rough paths with $\mathcal{C}^{\alpha}$, cf. [15, Chapter 9.2]).

Theorem 2. *Let* $\alpha \in \left(\frac{1}{3}, \frac{1}{2}\right)$, $\boldsymbol{\eta} \in \mathcal{C}^{0,\alpha}\left(\mathbb{R}^d\right)$ *and* $B = \left(B^i\right)_{i=1}^e$ *be an e-dimensional Brownian motion carried on a probability space* $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathcal{F}_t, \mathbb{P})$ *satisfying the usual conditions. Then for every* $\alpha' < \alpha$ *there exists a* $\mathcal{C}^{0,\alpha'}\left(\mathbb{R}^{d+e}\right)$ *-valued random variable* $\boldsymbol{\Lambda} = \boldsymbol{\Lambda}^{\boldsymbol{\eta}}$ *on* $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathcal{F}_t, \mathbb{P})$ *which fulfills* $\mathbb{P}$*-a.s. that for every* $t \geq 0$,

$$\boldsymbol{\Lambda}_t^{1;i} := \begin{cases} \boldsymbol{\eta}_t^{1;i} & , \text{ if } i \in \{1, \dots, d\} \\ B_t^{i-d} & , \text{ if } i \in \{d+1, \dots, d+e\} \end{cases} \tag{2.1}$$

$$\boldsymbol{\Lambda}_t^{2;i,j} := \begin{cases} \boldsymbol{\eta}_t^{2;i,j} & , \text{ if } i,j \in \{1, \dots, d\} \\ \int_0^t B_r^{i-d} \circ dB_r^{j-d} & , \text{ if } i,j \in \{d+1, \dots, d+e\} . \end{cases}$$

Moreover,

(i) $\boldsymbol{\Lambda}^{\boldsymbol{\eta}}$ *has Gaussian tails, locally uniform in* $\boldsymbol{\eta}$: $\forall r > 0$ *there exists a constant* $b = b(\alpha', \alpha, T, r) > 0$ *such that*

$$\sup_{|\boldsymbol{\eta}|_{\alpha-H\ddot{o}l} \leq r} \mathbb{E} \exp\left(b \left\|\boldsymbol{\Lambda}^{\boldsymbol{\eta}}\right\|_{\alpha'-H\ddot{o}l}^2\right) < \infty. \tag{2.2}$$

(ii) $\boldsymbol{\eta} \mapsto \boldsymbol{\Lambda}^{\boldsymbol{\eta}}$ *is locally Lipschitz in* L^q: $\forall r > 0$, *there exists a constant* $c_{Lip} = c_{Lip}(r, q, \alpha, \alpha')$ *such that for all* $\boldsymbol{\eta}, \bar{\boldsymbol{\eta}} \in \mathcal{C}^{0,\alpha}$ *with* $\|\boldsymbol{\eta}\|_{\alpha-H\ddot{o}l}, \|\bar{\boldsymbol{\eta}}\|_{\alpha-H\ddot{o}l} \leq r$

$$\left|\rho_{\alpha'}\left(\boldsymbol{\Lambda}^{\boldsymbol{\eta}}, \boldsymbol{\Lambda}^{\bar{\boldsymbol{\eta}}}\right)\right|_{L^q(\Omega;\mathbb{R})} \leq c_{Lip}\rho_\alpha(\boldsymbol{\eta}, \bar{\boldsymbol{\eta}}).$$

(iii) $\boldsymbol{\Lambda}$ *is consistent with the Stratonovich lift for semimartingales: let* N *be a multidimensional continuous semimartingale carried on another probability space* $\left(\overline{\Omega}, \overline{\mathcal{F}}, \overline{\mathcal{F}}_t, \overline{\mathbb{P}}\right)$ *and consider the product space with* $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathcal{F}_t, \mathbb{P})$ *equipped with* $\overline{\mathbb{P}} \otimes \mathbb{P}$. *Denote with* $\boldsymbol{N}$ *resp.* $(\boldsymbol{N}, \boldsymbol{B})$ *the Stratonovich lift of the semimartingales* N *resp.* (N, B). *Then for* $\overline{\mathbb{P}}$*-a.e.* $\overline{\omega} \in \overline{\Omega}$ *we have*

$$\mathbb{P}\left[\omega : \boldsymbol{\Lambda}^{\boldsymbol{N}(\overline{\omega})}(\omega) = (\boldsymbol{N}, \boldsymbol{B})(\overline{\omega} \otimes \omega)\right] = 1.$$

Proof. Define

$$\boldsymbol{\Lambda}_t^{1;i} := \begin{cases} \boldsymbol{\eta}^{1;i} & , \text{if } i \in \{1, \dots, d\} \\ B^{i-d} & , \text{if } i \in \{d+1, \dots, d+e\} \end{cases},$$

$$\boldsymbol{\Lambda}_t^{2;i,j} := \begin{cases} \boldsymbol{\eta}^{2;i,j} & , \text{if } i,j \in \{1, \dots, d\} \\ \int_0^t B_r^{i-d} \circ dB_r^{j-d} & , \text{if } i,j \in \{d+1, \dots, d+e\} \\ \int_0^t \eta_u^i dB_u^{j-d} & , \text{if } i \in \{1, \dots, d\}, j \in \{1+d, \dots, d+e\} \\ \eta_t^j B_t^{i-d} - \int_0^t \eta_u^j dB_u^{i-d} & , \text{if } i \in \{d+1, \dots, d+e\}, j \in \{1, \dots, d\} . \end{cases}$$

---

[3] We denote norms on linear spaces with $|.|$ and "norms" on non-linear spaces (like G_d^2 or $\mathcal{C}_d^{0,\alpha}$ with $\|.\|$).

Then $\mathbf{\Lambda}_t = \left(1 + \mathbf{\Lambda}^1_t + \mathbf{\Lambda}^2_t\right) \in 1 + \mathbb{R}^{d+e} + \left(\mathbb{R}^{d+e}\right)^{\otimes 2}$ and a direct calculation shows that $\mathbf{\Lambda}_{s,t} := \mathbf{\Lambda}^{-1}_s \otimes \mathbf{\Lambda}_t = \exp\left[(\eta_{s,t}, B_{s,t}) + A_{s,t}\right]$ with[4]

(2.3)

$$so(d) \ni A^{i,j}_{s,t} := \begin{cases} \frac{1}{2}\left(\int_s^t \eta^i_{s,u} d\eta^j_u - \int_s^t \eta^j_{s,u} d\eta^i_u\right) & \text{, if } i,j \in \{1,\dots,d\} \\ \frac{1}{2}\left(\int_s^t B^{i-d}_{s,u} dB^{j-d}_u - \int_s^t B^{j-d}_{s,u} dB^{i-d}_u\right) & \text{, if } i,j \in \{d+1,\dots,d+e\} \\ \left(\int_s^t \eta^i_{s,u} dB^{j-d}_u - \frac{1}{2}\eta^i_{s,t} B^{j-d}_{s,t}\right) & \text{, if } i \in \{1,\dots,d\}, j \in \{1+d,\dots,d+e\} \\ \left(-\int_0^t \eta^j_u dB^{i-d}_u + \frac{1}{2}\eta^j_{s,t} B^{i-d}_{s,t}\right) & \text{, if } i \in \{d+1,\dots,d+e\}, j \in \{1,\dots,d\}. \end{cases}$$

That is, (after throwing away a nullset depending on B and $\boldsymbol{\eta}$) we have shown that $t \mapsto \mathbf{\Lambda}_t$ is a continuous path that takes values in $G^2\left(\mathbb{R}^{d+e}\right)$. It remains to demonstrate that $\|\mathbf{\Lambda}\|_{\alpha'-H\ddot{o}l} < \infty$ for any $\alpha' < \alpha$ which is then enough to conclude that $\mathbf{\Lambda} \in \mathcal{C}^{0,\alpha'}\left(\mathbb{R}^{d+e}\right)$ $\mathbb{P}$-a.s. for $\alpha' < \alpha$ due to the embedding of weak geometric rough paths into geometric rough paths ($\mathcal{C}^{\beta} \subset \mathcal{C}^{0,\beta'}$ for $\beta > \beta'$ follows from [14, Theorem 19]). We show this Hölder regularity by proving a stronger statement, namely that $\|\mathbf{\Lambda}\|_{\alpha'}$ has Gaussian tails. It is clear that the first level of $\mathbf{\Lambda}$ is α-Hölder; to deal with the second level note that $|A_{st}| \sim \sum_{ij}\left|A^{ij}_{st}\right|$ and that $2\alpha-$Hölder regularity already holds for the first two cases, that is $i,j \in \{1,\dots,d\}$ and $i,j \in \{d+1,\dots,d+e\}$ (in fact even a Gauss tail via the Fernique estimate for rough path norms [12]). Now for the remaining case we have from above definition of $A^{i,j}$ that

$$\left|A^{i,j}_{s,t}\right| \leq \left|\int_s^t \eta^i_{s,u} dB^j_u\right| + \frac{1}{2}\left|\eta^i_{s,t} B^j_{s,t}\right|$$

and since $\left|\eta^i_{s,t} B^j_{s,t}\right| \leq |\eta|_{\alpha-H\ddot{o}l}\, |B|_{\alpha-H\ddot{o}l}\, |t-s|^{2\alpha}$ it just remains to treat $\left|\int_s^t \eta^i_{s,u} dB^j_u\right|$. But since for each $s < t$, $\int_s^t \eta^i_{s,u} dB^j_u$ has the same distribution as $\sqrt{\int_s^t \left(\eta^i_{s,u}\right)^2 du}.Z$ for some fixed $Z \sim \mathcal{N}(0,1)$, we also have

$$\exp\left[\eta\left(\frac{\left|\int_s^t \left(\eta^i_{s,u}\right) dB^j_u\right|}{(t-s)^{2\alpha}}\right)^2\right] =^{Law} \exp\left[\eta Z^2\left(\frac{\sqrt{\left|\int_s^t \left(\eta^i_{s,u}\right)^2 du\right|}}{(t-s)^{2\alpha}}\right)^2\right]$$

and by the elementary estimate $\left|\int_s^t \left(\eta^i_{s,u}\right)^2 du\right| \leq \|\eta\|^2_{\alpha-H\ddot{o}l}\, (t-s)^{2\alpha+1}$ we can conclude by taking $\sup_{s<t}\mathbb{E}$ in above expression and using the Gaussian integrability for Z, i.e. there exists a $\kappa > 0$ such that

$$\sup_{s<t}\mathbb{E}\exp\left[\kappa Z^2\, |\eta|^2_{\alpha-H\ddot{o}l}\, (t-s)^{1-2\alpha}\right] < \infty.$$

By [15, Theorem A.19] this yields the desired $2\alpha'$-Hölder regularity of $\left|\int_s^t \eta^i_{s,u} dB^j_u\right|$ for any $\alpha' < \alpha$. Putting everything together, we have shown that $\|\mathbf{\Lambda}\|_{\alpha'-H\ddot{o}l} < \infty$, $\mathbb{P}$-a.s. In fact we even have shown

---

[4] We could define $\mathbf{\Lambda}$ directly via (2.3) but the above way might be a bit more intuitive.

$$\sup_{\|\boldsymbol{\eta}\|_{\alpha-H\ddot{o}l}\leq r} \mathbb{E}\exp\left(b\left\|\boldsymbol{\Lambda}^{\boldsymbol{\eta}}\right\|_{\alpha'-H\ddot{o}l}^{2}\right)<\infty,\ \ \forall\alpha'<\alpha.$$

It remains to show the claimed Lipschitz continuity of the map $\boldsymbol{\eta}\mapsto\boldsymbol{\Lambda}^{\boldsymbol{\eta}}$. Therefore let $q\geq q_0\left(\alpha,\alpha'\right)$, as given in [15, Theorem A.13], take $\boldsymbol{\eta},\bar{\boldsymbol{\eta}}\in\mathcal{C}^{0,\alpha}$ with $\|\boldsymbol{\eta}\|_{\alpha-H\ddot{o}l},\|\bar{\boldsymbol{\eta}}\|_{\alpha-H\ddot{o}l}\leq r$ and denote the corresponding lifts $\boldsymbol{\Lambda}^{\boldsymbol{\eta}},\boldsymbol{\Lambda}^{\overline{\boldsymbol{\eta}}}$. Set $\varepsilon:=\rho_{\alpha'}\left(\boldsymbol{\Lambda}^{\boldsymbol{\eta}},\boldsymbol{\Lambda}^{\overline{\boldsymbol{\eta}}}\right)$. By (2.2) there exists a constant $c_1=c_1\left(q,r\right)$ such that (we denote the Carnot–Caratheodory metric on G^2_{d+e} with d_{CC})

$$\left|d_{CC}\left(\boldsymbol{\Lambda}_s,\boldsymbol{\Lambda}_t\right)\right|^q_{L^q(\Omega;\mathbb{R})},\left|d_{CC}\left(\boldsymbol{\Lambda}^{\overline{\boldsymbol{\eta}}}_s,\boldsymbol{\Lambda}^{\overline{\boldsymbol{\eta}}}_t\right)\right|^q_{L^q(\Omega;\mathbb{R})}\leq c_1\left|t-s\right|^{\alpha q}.$$

Moreover

$$\begin{aligned}\left|\pi_1\left(\boldsymbol{\Lambda}^{\boldsymbol{\eta}}_{s,t}-\boldsymbol{\Lambda}^{\overline{\boldsymbol{\eta}}}_{s,t}\right)\right|_{L^q(\Omega;\mathbb{R})}&=\left|\eta_{s,t}-\bar{\eta}_{s,t}\right|^{q}\\&\leq\varepsilon^q\left|t-s\right|^{\alpha q},\end{aligned}$$

and (again the constants c may only depend on r and q)

$$\begin{aligned}\left|\pi_2\left(\boldsymbol{\Lambda}^{\boldsymbol{\eta}}_{s,t}-\boldsymbol{\Lambda}^{\overline{\boldsymbol{\eta}}}_{s,t}\right)\right|^{2/q}_{L^{q/2}(\Omega;\mathbb{R})}&=\left|\frac{1}{2}\pi_1\left(\boldsymbol{\Lambda}^{\boldsymbol{\eta}}_{s,t}-\boldsymbol{\Lambda}^{\overline{\boldsymbol{\eta}}}_{s,t}\right)\otimes\pi_1\left(\boldsymbol{\Lambda}^{\boldsymbol{\eta}}_{s,t}-\boldsymbol{\Lambda}^{\overline{\boldsymbol{\eta}}}_{s,t}\right)+A_{s,t}-\bar{A}_{s,t}\right|^{2/q}_{L^q(\Omega;\mathbb{R})}\\&\leq c\varepsilon^{q/2}\left|t-s\right|^{\alpha q}+\left|A_{s,t}-\bar{A}_{s,t}\right|^{2/q}_{L^{q/2}(\Omega;\mathbb{R})}\end{aligned}$$

Also,

$$\left|\int_s^t\eta^i_{s,u}d\eta^j_u-\int_s^t\eta^j_{s,u}d\eta^i_u-\left(\int_s^t\bar{\eta}^i_{s,u}d\bar{\eta}^j_u-\int_s^t\bar{\eta}^j_{s,u}d\bar{\eta}^i_u\right)\right|^{2/q}_{L^{q/2}(\Omega;\mathbb{R})}\leq\varepsilon^{q/2}\left|t-s\right|^{\alpha q},$$

and finally

$$\begin{aligned}&\left|\int_s^t\eta^i_{s,u}dB^{j-d_Y}_u-\frac{1}{2}\eta^i_{s,t}B^{j-d}_{s,t}-\left(\int_s^t\bar{\eta}^i_{s,u}dB^{j-d}_u-\frac{1}{2}\bar{\eta}^i_{s,t}B^{j-d}_{s,t}\right)\right|^{2/q}_{L^{q/2}(\Omega;\mathbb{R})}\\ \leq\ & c\left|\int_s^t\eta^i_{s,u}-\bar{\eta}^i_{s,u}dB^{j-d}_u\right|^{2/q}_{L^{q/2}(\Omega;\mathbb{R})}+c\left|\eta^i_{s,t}B^{j-d_Y}_{s,t}-\bar{\eta}^i_{s,t}B^{j-d}_{s,t}\right|^{2/q}_{L^{q/2}(\Omega;\mathbb{R})}\\ \leq\ & c\left|\int_s^t\left|\eta^i_{s,u}-\bar{\eta}^i_{s,u}\right|^2du\right|^{q/4}+c\left|\eta^i_{s,t}-\eta^i_{s,t}\right|^{q/2}\left|B^{j-d}_{s,t}\right|^{2/q}_{L^{q/2}(\Omega;\mathbb{R})}\\ \leq\ & c\varepsilon^{q/2}\left|t-s\right|^{\alpha q/2+q/4}+c\varepsilon^{q/2}\left|t-s\right|^{\alpha q/2}\left|t-s\right|^{q/4}\\ \leq\ & c\varepsilon^{q/2}\left|t-s\right|^{\alpha q}.\end{aligned}$$

Hence,

$$\left|\pi_2\left(\boldsymbol{\Lambda}^{\boldsymbol{\eta}}_{s,t}-\boldsymbol{\Lambda}^{\overline{\boldsymbol{\eta}}}_{s,t}\right)\right|^{2/q}_{L^{q/2}(\Omega;\mathbb{R})}\leq c_2\varepsilon^{q/2}\left|t-s\right|^{\alpha q}$$

and applied with $m = m\left(r,q\right) := \max\left\{1, c_1^{1/q}, c_2^{1/(2q)}\right\}$ we have $\forall q \geq 1$ that

$$\begin{aligned} \left| d_{CC}\left(\mathbf{\Lambda}_s^{\boldsymbol{\eta}}, \mathbf{\Lambda}_t^{\overline{\boldsymbol{\eta}}}\right)\right|_{L^q(\Omega;\mathbb{R})} &\leq m\left|t-s\right|^{\alpha}, \\ \left|\pi_1\left(\mathbf{\Lambda}_{s,t}^{\boldsymbol{\eta}} - \mathbf{\Lambda}_{s,t}^{\overline{\boldsymbol{\eta}}}\right)\right|_{L^q(\Omega;\mathbb{R})} &\leq \varepsilon m\left|t-s\right|^{\alpha}, \\ \left|\pi_2\left(\mathbf{\Lambda}_{s,t}^{\boldsymbol{\eta}} - \mathbf{\Lambda}_{s,t}^{\overline{\boldsymbol{\eta}}}\right)\right|_{L^{q/2}(\Omega;\mathbb{R})} &\leq \varepsilon m^2\left|t-s\right|^{2\alpha}. \end{aligned}$$

By [15, Theorem A.13 (i)] there exists a q large enough and a constant $k = k\left(\alpha, \alpha', T, q\right)$ such that

$$\left|\sup_{s<t}\frac{\left|\pi_1\left(\mathbf{\Lambda}_{s,t}^{\boldsymbol{\eta}} - \mathbf{\Lambda}_{s,t}^{\overline{\boldsymbol{\eta}}}\right)\right|}{\left|t-s\right|^{\alpha'}}\right|_{L^q(\Omega;\mathbb{R})} \leq \varepsilon k m \text{ and } \left|\sup_{s<t}\frac{\left|\pi_2\left(\mathbf{\Lambda}_{s,t}^{\boldsymbol{\eta}} - \mathbf{\Lambda}_{s,t}^{\overline{\boldsymbol{\eta}}}\right)\right|}{\left|t-s\right|^{\alpha'}}\right|_{L^{q/2}(\Omega;\mathbb{R})} \leq \varepsilon\left(km\right)^2$$

Using this with q and $2q$ we get from the definition of $\rho_{\alpha'}$ that

$$\left|\rho_{\alpha'-H\ddot{o}l}\left(\mathbf{\Lambda}^{\boldsymbol{\eta}}, \mathbf{\Lambda}^{\overline{\boldsymbol{\eta}}}\right)\right|_{L^q(\Omega;\mathbb{R})} \leq \left|\sup_{s\neq t}\frac{\left|\pi_1\left(\mathbf{\Lambda}_{s,t}^{\boldsymbol{\eta}} - \mathbf{\Lambda}_{s,t}^{\overline{\boldsymbol{\eta}}}\right)\right|}{\left|t-s\right|^{\alpha'}}\right|_{L^q(\Omega;\mathbb{R})} + \left|\sup_{s\neq t}\frac{\left|\pi_2\left(\mathbf{\Lambda}_{s,t}^{\boldsymbol{\eta}} - \mathbf{\Lambda}_{s,t}^{\overline{\boldsymbol{\eta}}}\right)\right|}{\left|t-s\right|^{2\alpha'}}\right|_{L^q(\Omega;\mathbb{R})} \leq c_{Lip}\varepsilon$$

In the above argument we assumed that q is large enough, but since L^p is Lipschitz continuously embedded in L^q for $p > q$, the result follows for all q. □

Remark 3. The nullset on which the equality (2.1) holds depends on $\boldsymbol{\eta} \in \mathcal{C}^{0,\alpha}\left(\mathbb{R}^{d+e}\right)$ (and the version of the stochastic process B). However, the important property of the lift is the local Lipschitzness of $\boldsymbol{\eta} \mapsto \mathbf{\Lambda}^{\boldsymbol{\eta}}$ in $L^q\left(\Omega\right)$ which allows to treat the RSDEs in Section 3 as welle as the applications in Section 4.

3. Rough and stochastic differential equations

Our goal is to give meaning to the differential equation

$$dS_t^{\boldsymbol{\eta}} = a\left(S_r^{\boldsymbol{\eta}}\right)dr + b\left(S_r^{\boldsymbol{\eta}}\right)\circ dB_r + c\left(S_r^{\boldsymbol{\eta}}\right)d\boldsymbol{\eta},$$

i.e. for a fixed rough path $\boldsymbol{\eta}$ we want to find a stochastic process $S^{\boldsymbol{\eta}}$ on the probability space which carries the Brownian motion B. Theorem 2 guarantees the existence of a canonical, random joint lift $\mathbf{\Lambda}$ of B and $\boldsymbol{\eta}$, hence we can solve for every fixed rough path $\boldsymbol{\eta} \in \mathcal{C}_d^{0,\alpha}$ the random RDE

$$\begin{aligned} dS &= a\left(S\right)dr + \left(b,c\right)d\mathbf{\Lambda} \\ &= \left(a,b,c\right)d\left(r,\mathbf{\Lambda}\right). \end{aligned}$$

Theorem 6 shows that this is indeed the right solution in terms of approximation results as well as continuity of the solution map; Theorem 7 shows consistency with usual SDE solution in the case that $\boldsymbol{\eta}$ is the rough path lift of another Brownian motion. Before that we introduce some standard notation.

Definition 4. Let $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathcal{F}_t, \mathbb{P})$ be a filtered probability space satisfying the usual condition. Denote with $\mathcal{S}^0(\Omega)$ the space of adapted, continuous processes in $\mathbb{R}^{d_S}$, with the topology of uniform convergence in probability. For $q \geq 1$ we denote with $\mathcal{S}^q(\Omega)$ the space of processes $X \in \mathcal{S}^0$ such that

$$|X|_{\mathcal{S}^q} := \left| |X|_{\infty;[0,t]} \right|_{L^q(\Omega;\mathbb{R})} = \left(\mathbb{E}\left[\sup_{s \leq t} |X_s|^q \right] \right)^{1/q} < \infty.$$

3.1. **Existence and continuity of the solution map.**

Assumption 5. *$a \in Lip^{1+\epsilon}$ for some $\epsilon > 0$, $\alpha \in \left(\frac{1}{3}, \frac{1}{2}\right)$, $\gamma > \frac{1}{\alpha}$ and $b, c \in Lip^{\gamma}$.*

Theorem 6. *Let $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathcal{F}_t, \mathbb{P})$ be a filtered probability space satisfying the usual conditions and carrying a e-dimensional Brownian motion B and a random variable S_0 independent of B. Let (a, b, c) fulfill Assumption 5 for some $\alpha \in \left(\frac{1}{3}, \frac{1}{2}\right)$. Then there exists a d_S-dimensional process $S^{\boldsymbol{\eta}} \in \mathcal{S}^0$ such that for every sequence $(\eta^n)_n$, $\eta^n \in C^1\left([0,T], \mathbb{R}^d\right)$ and such that $\left(1 + \eta^n + \int \eta^n \otimes d\eta^n\right) \to_n \boldsymbol{\eta}$ in ρ_α-metric for some $\boldsymbol{\eta} \in \mathcal{C}^{0,\alpha}$, the solutions $(S^n)_n$ of the SDE*

$$dS_t^n = a(S_t^n)\,dt + b(S_t^n) \circ dB_t + c(S_t^n)\,d\eta_t^n,\ S^n(0) = S_0^n.$$

converge uniformly on compacts in probability to $S^{\boldsymbol{\eta}}$,

$$S^n \to_{n\to\infty} S^{\boldsymbol{\eta}} \text{ in } \mathcal{S}^0 \tag{3.1}$$

and the process $S^{\boldsymbol{\eta}}$ only depends on $\boldsymbol{\eta}$ and the process B but not on the approximating sequence $(\eta^n)_n$. We say that $S^{\boldsymbol{\eta}}$ is the solution of the RSDE

$$S_t^{\boldsymbol{\eta}} = S_0 + \int_0^t a(S_r^{\boldsymbol{\eta}})\,dr + \int_0^t b(S_r^{\boldsymbol{\eta}}) \circ dB_r + \int_0^t c(S_r^{\boldsymbol{\eta}})\,d\boldsymbol{\eta}.$$

Moreover,

1. *$\forall q \geq 1$, $S^{\boldsymbol{\eta}} \in \mathcal{S}^q(\Omega)$, the map*

$$\left(\mathcal{C}^{0,\alpha}, \rho_\alpha\right) \to \left(\mathcal{S}^q(\Omega), |.|_{\mathcal{S}^q}\right), \boldsymbol{\eta} \mapsto S^{\boldsymbol{\eta}} \tag{3.2}$$

   is locally Lipschitz continuous,

2. *$\forall r > 0, \forall q \geq 1$*

$$\sup_{\|\boldsymbol{\eta}\|_{\alpha-H\ddot{o}l} \leq r} \mathbb{E}\left[\exp\left(q\,|S^{\boldsymbol{\eta}}|_{\infty;[0,T]}\right)\right] < \infty.$$

Proof. Choose $\alpha' < \alpha$ large enough, such that $\gamma > 1/\alpha'$ and apply standard existence and uniqueness results[5] to get a solution $S^{\boldsymbol{\eta}}$ of the RDE

$$S_t^{\boldsymbol{\eta}} = S_0 + \int_0^t a(S_r^{\boldsymbol{\eta}})\,dr + \int_0^t (b, c)(S_r^{\boldsymbol{\eta}})\,d\boldsymbol{\Lambda}_r^{\boldsymbol{\eta}}. \tag{3.3}$$

---

[5] We only have $a \in Lip^{1+\epsilon}$ so we have to use results on RDEs with drift (e.g. [15, Theorem 12.6 and Theorem 12.10]) to get existence of a unique solution.

Point (1) (and (3.1)). Let $\boldsymbol{\eta}, \bar{\boldsymbol{\eta}} \in \mathcal{C}^{0,\alpha}\left(\mathbb{R}^d\right)$, $\alpha' < \alpha$ with $\gamma > p' := \frac{1}{\alpha'}$. By [6, Theorem 8] we have the deterministic estimate[6], that for some $c^\star$, any $\beta \in (0,1)$ there exists $c = c\left(c^\star, \beta\right)$ such that

$$\rho_{p'-var}\left(S^{\boldsymbol{\eta}}, S^{\overline{\boldsymbol{\eta}}}\right) \leq c.\rho_{p'-var}\left(\boldsymbol{\Lambda}^{\boldsymbol{\eta}}, \boldsymbol{\Lambda}^{\overline{\boldsymbol{\eta}}}\right) \exp\left(-N\left(\beta, c^\star\right) \log\left(1-\beta\right)\right)$$

where v, N are given as in Lemma 14 below. Hence, for every $q \geq 1$,

$$\begin{aligned}
\left|\sup_{t \leq T}\left|S_t^{\boldsymbol{\eta}} - S_t^{\overline{\boldsymbol{\eta}}}\right|\right|_{L^q(\Omega;\mathbb{R})} &\leq \left|\rho_{p'-var}\left(S^{\boldsymbol{\eta}}, S^{\overline{\boldsymbol{\eta}}}\right)\right|_{L^q(\Omega;\mathbb{R})} \\
&\leq c\left|\rho_{p'-var}\left(\boldsymbol{\Lambda}^{\boldsymbol{\eta}}, \boldsymbol{\Lambda}^{\overline{\boldsymbol{\eta}}}\right)\right|_{L^{2q}(\Omega;\mathbb{R})}\left|\exp\left(-N\left(\beta, c^\star\right)\log\left(1-\beta\right)\right)\right|_{L^{2q}(\Omega;\mathbb{R})} \\
&\leq c\left|\rho_{\alpha'-H\ddot{o}l}\left(\boldsymbol{\Lambda}^{\boldsymbol{\eta}}, \boldsymbol{\Lambda}^{\overline{\boldsymbol{\eta}}}\right)\right|_{L^{2q}(\Omega;\mathbb{R})}\left|\exp\left(-N\left(\beta, c^\star\right)\log\left(1-\beta\right)\right)\right|_{L^{2q}(\Omega;\mathbb{R})} \\
&\leq c\rho_{\alpha-H\ddot{o}l}\left(\boldsymbol{\eta}, \bar{\boldsymbol{\eta}}\right)\left|\exp\left(-N\left(\beta, c^\star\right)\right)\log\left(1-\beta\right)\right|_{L^{2q}(\Omega;\mathbb{R})}.
\end{aligned}$$

By Lemma 14 we know that for every $q \geq 1, r > 0$ there exists $\beta_0(q,r) > 0$ such that for $\|\boldsymbol{\eta}\|_{\alpha-H\ddot{o}l}, \|\bar{\boldsymbol{\eta}}\|_{\alpha-H\ddot{o}l} \leq r$, we have for $\beta \leq \beta_0$ that

$$\left|\exp\left(-N\left(\beta, c^\star\right)\log\left(1-\beta\right)\right)\right|_{L^q(\Omega;\mathbb{R})}$$

is bounded. This yields the desired local Lipschitzness of the solution map (3.2). Now apply this continuity with the fact that if $\boldsymbol{\eta}$ is the lift of a smooth path η, then $S^{\boldsymbol{\eta}}$ is the standard SDE solution of the SDE

$$dS = a\left(S_r\right)dr + b\left(S_r\right)dB_r + c\left(S_r\right)d\eta_r.$$

(e.g. [15, Section 17.5]).

Point (2). Fix $r > 0$ and apply [15, Theorem 10.14] to get

$$|S|_{p'-var;[s,t]} \leq c\left(\|\boldsymbol{\Lambda}\|_{p'-var;[s,t]} \vee \|\boldsymbol{\Lambda}\|_{p'-var;[s,t]}^{p'}\right).$$

and define the control

$$V(s,t) := \left(\|\boldsymbol{\Lambda}\|_{p'-var;[s,t]} \vee \|\boldsymbol{\Lambda}\|_{p'-var;[s,t]}^{p'}\right)^{p'}.$$

Then for any partition D of $[0,t]$

$$\begin{aligned}
|S|_{\infty;[0,t]} &\leq \left|S_0\right| + \sum_{t_i \in D}\left|S_{\cdot} - S_{t_i}\right|_{\infty;[t_i,t_{i+1}]} \\
&\leq \left|S_0\right| + \sum_{t_i \in D}|S|_{p-var;[t_i,t_{i+1}]} \\
&\leq \left|S_0\right| + c\sum_{t_i \in D} V\left(t_i, t_{i+1}\right)^{1/p'}.
\end{aligned}$$

Using for $a > 0$ the partition defined as

$$t_0(a) := 0 \text{ and } t_{i+1}(a) := \inf\left\{s \geq t_i(a) : V\left(\sigma_i(a), s\right) \geq a^{p'}\right\} \vee t,$$

---

[6] This estimate modifies the estimates in [15] in a way that is essential to get integrability in our context.

we arrive at

$$|S|_{\infty;[0,t]} \leq |S_0| + c.a^{p'} \left(\sup\{n : t_n < t\} + 1\right).$$

The exponential integrability then follows as in the proof of Lemma 14. $\square$

3.2. **Consistency with SDE solutions.**

Theorem 7. *Let* $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathcal{F}_t, \mathbb{P})$*,* B*,*S_0 *and* a, b, c *be as in Theorem 6. Let* $\left(\overline{\Omega}, \overline{\mathcal{F}}, \overline{\mathcal{F}}_t, \overline{\mathbb{P}}\right)$ *be another probablity space satisfying the usual conditions and carrying a* $\overline{e}$*-dimensional Brownian motion* $\overline{B}$ *and denote*

$$\left(\hat{\Omega}, \hat{\mathcal{F}}, \hat{\mathcal{F}}_t, \hat{\mathbb{P}}\right) = \left(\Omega \times \overline{\Omega}, \mathcal{F} \otimes \overline{\mathcal{F}}_t, \mathcal{F}_t \otimes \overline{\mathcal{F}}_t, \mathbb{P} \otimes \overline{\mathbb{P}}\right).$$

Let $\hat{S}$ *be the unique solution on* $\left(\hat{\Omega}, \hat{\mathcal{F}}, \hat{\mathcal{F}}_t, \hat{\mathbb{P}}\right)$ *of the SDE*

$$\hat{S}_t = \hat{S}_0 + \int_0^t a\left(\hat{S}_r\right) dr + \int_0^t b\left(\hat{S}_r\right) \circ dB_r + \int_0^t c\left(\hat{S}_r\right) \circ d\overline{B}_r. \tag{3.4}$$

Denote with $\overline{\boldsymbol{B}}$ *the Stratonovich lift of the Brownian motion* $\overline{B}$ *on* $\left(\overline{\Omega}, \overline{\mathcal{F}}, \overline{\mathcal{F}}_t, \overline{\mathbb{P}}\right)$*. Then for* $\overline{\mathbb{P}}$*-a.e.* $\overline{\omega} \in \overline{\Omega}$

$$\mathbb{P}\left[\hat{S}_t(\overline{\omega}, \cdot) = S_t^{\overline{\boldsymbol{B}}(\overline{\omega})}(\cdot), t \in [0, T]\right] = 1. \tag{3.5}$$

Proof. Denote with $\left(\overline{\boldsymbol{B}}, \boldsymbol{B}\right)$ the enhanced Brownian motion of the $(\overline{e} + e)$-dimensional Brownian motion $\left(\overline{B}, B\right)$ on $\left(\hat{\Omega}, \hat{\mathcal{F}}, \hat{\mathcal{F}}_t, \hat{\mathbb{P}}\right)$. We want to compare it to $\boldsymbol{\Lambda}^{\overline{\boldsymbol{B}}}$, i.e. Theorem 2 applied with $\boldsymbol{\eta} = \overline{\boldsymbol{B}}$. Note, cannot use that $\hat{\omega} = (\overline{\omega}, \omega) \mapsto \boldsymbol{\Lambda}^{\overline{\boldsymbol{B}}(\overline{\omega})}(\omega)$ is a random variable on $\hat{\Omega}$, i.e. it might not necessarily be $\hat{\mathcal{F}}$-measurable (joint measurability in $(\overline{\omega}, \omega)$). However, we know by the construction of $\boldsymbol{\Lambda}^{\overline{\boldsymbol{B}}}$ that $\pi_1\left(\boldsymbol{\Lambda}^{\overline{\boldsymbol{B}}}\right)$ is $\hat{\mathcal{F}}$-measurable and coincides with $\pi_1\left(\left(\overline{\boldsymbol{B}}, \boldsymbol{B}\right)\right)$ $\hat{\mathbb{P}}$-a.s. We now consider only one component of the second level, the others follow similarly. So without loss of generality let $i \in \{1, \ldots, \overline{e}\}, j \in \{\overline{e} + 1, \ldots, \overline{e} + e\}$. Then

$$\left(\overline{\boldsymbol{B}}, \boldsymbol{B}\right)_t^{(2);i,j} = \int_0^t \overline{B}_r^i dB_r^{j-\overline{e}}, \ \hat{\mathbb{P}} - a.s.$$

By standard results on Ito-integration we have

$$\left(\int_0^t \overline{B}_r^i dB_r^{j-d_Y}\right)(\overline{\omega}, \omega) = \lim_{n \to \infty} \sum_{k=1}^{2^n} \overline{B}_{(k-1)/2^n t}^k(\overline{\omega}) \left[B_{k/2^n t}^{j-\overline{e}}(\omega) - B_{(k-1)/2^n t}^{j-\overline{e}}(\omega)\right]$$

for all $\hat{\omega} = (\overline{\omega}, \omega)$ in $\hat{A} \subset \hat{\mathcal{F}}$ and $\hat{\mathbb{P}}\left[\hat{A}\right] = 1$. By a Fubini type theorem (e.g. [1, Theorem 3.4.1]), there exists a $\mathring{\Omega} \subset \Omega$ such that for $\omega \in \mathring{\Omega}$ we have that $\hat{A}_\omega := \left\{\omega : (\overline{\omega}, \omega) \in \hat{A}\right\}$ satisfy $\mathbb{P}^B\left[\hat{A}_\omega\right] = 1$. On the other hand for fixed $\overline{\omega} \in \overline{\Omega}$

$$\boldsymbol{\Lambda}_t^{(2);i,j}\left(\overline{\boldsymbol{B}}(\overline{\omega})\right) = \int_0^t \overline{B}_r^i(\overline{\omega}) dB_r^{j-d_1}.$$

Now

$$\left(\int_0^t \overline{B}_r^i(\overline{\omega})dB_r^{j-d_Y}\right)(\omega) = \lim_{m\to\infty}\sum_{k=1}^{2^{n_m}} \overline{B}^k_{(k-1)/2^{n_m}t}(\overline{\omega})\left[B^{j-e}_{k/2^{n_m}t}(\omega) - B^{j-e}_{(k-1)/2^{n_m}t}(\omega)\right]$$

for $\omega^B \in D_\omega \subset \Omega^{\hat{B}}$ with $\mathbb{P}^{\hat{B}}[D_\omega] = 1$. Here, D_ω as well as the subsequence $(n_m)_m$ will depend on ω. So for $\omega \in \mathring{\Omega}, \omega^B \in \hat{A}_\omega \cap D_\omega$ we have that

$$\begin{aligned}
\left(\int_0^t \overline{B}_r^i dB_r^{j-d_Y}\right)\left(\omega, \omega^B\right) &= \lim_{n\to\infty}\sum_{k=1}^{2^n} \overline{B}^k_{(k-1)/2^n t}(\omega)\left[B^{j-d_Y}_{k/2^n t}\left(\omega^{\bar{B}}\right) - B^{j-d_Y}_{(k-1)/2^n t}\left(\omega^{\bar{B}}\right)\right] \\
&= \lim_{m\to\infty}\sum_{k=1}^{2^{n_m}} \overline{B}^k_{(k-1)/2^{n_m}t}(\omega)\left[B^{j-d_Y}_{k/2^{n_m}t}\left(\omega^{\bar{B}}\right) - B^{j-d_Y}_{(k-1)/2^{n_m}t}\left(\omega^{\bar{B}}\right)\right] \\
&= \left(\int_0^t \overline{B}_r^i(\omega)\, dB_r^{j-d_Y}\right)\left(\omega^{\bar{B}}\right).
\end{aligned}$$

Here, the second equality follows from the fact that the sum already converges along n, so it will converge along any subsequence $(n_m)_m$. Noting that for $\omega \in \mathring{\Omega}$ we have $\mathbb{P}^{\bar{B}}\left[\hat{A}_\omega \cap D_\omega\right] = 1$ we get that for $\mathbb{P}^Y$-a.e. $\omega \in \Omega$

$$\left(\overline{\boldsymbol{B}}, \boldsymbol{B}\right) = \boldsymbol{\Lambda}^{\overline{\boldsymbol{B}}(\omega)},\ \ \mathbb{P}^B - a.s. \tag{3.6}$$

Now by standard rough paths results (cf. [15, Section 17.5]), the RDE solution to (3.3) driven by $\left(\overline{\boldsymbol{B}}, \boldsymbol{B}\right)$ corresponds $\hat{\mathbb{P}}$-a.s. to the SDE solution of (3.4). Combining with (3.6) we arrive at (3.5). ☐

4. Applications

4.1. **Robustness in Nonlinear Filtering.** Nonlinear filtering is concerned with the estimation of a Markov process based on some observation of it; e.g. consider the classic case of a Markov process (X, Y) that takes values in $\mathbb{R}^{d_X + d_Y}$ of the form

$$\left\{\begin{array}{lcll} dX_t & = & l_0(X_t, Y_t)\,dt + \sum_k Z(X_t, Y_t)\,dB_t^k + \sum_j L_j(X_t, Y_t)\,d\tilde{B}_t^j & \text{(signal)} \\ dY_t & = & h(X_t, Y_t)\,dt + d\tilde{B}_t & \text{(observation)} \end{array}\right. \tag{4.1}$$

with B and $\tilde{B}$ independent, multidimensional Brownian motions. The goal is to compute for a given real-valued function φ

$$\pi_t(\varphi) = \mathbb{E}\left[\varphi(X_t)\,|\sigma(Y_r, r \in [0,t])\right].$$

From basic measure theory it follows that there exists a measurable map

$$\theta_t^\varphi : C\left([0,T], \mathbb{R}^{d_Y}\right) \to \mathbb{R} \ \text{ such that } \theta_t^\varphi\left(Y|_{[0,t]}\right) = \pi_t(\varphi)\ \ \mathbb{P} - a.s \tag{4.2}$$

In the late seventies Clark pointed out that this classic formulation is not justified in practice and it would be natural if $\theta_t^{\varphi}(.)$is continuous[7]. Clark showed that in the uncorrelated noise case (i.e. $L \equiv 0$ in 4.1) there exists a unique

$$\overline{\theta}_t^{\varphi} : C\left([0,T], \mathbb{R}^{d_Y}\right) \to \mathbb{R}$$

which is continuous in uniform norm and fulfills (4.2), thus providing a "robust version" of the conditional expectation $\pi_t(\varphi)$. Unfortunately in the correlated noise case this is no longer true (it is easy to construct counterexamples; see [7, Example 1]). Recently, it was shown in [7] that also in this situation robustness prevails, however only in a rough path sense, i.e. there exists a map

$$\overline{\theta}_t^{\varphi} : \mathcal{C}^{0,\alpha}\left(\mathbb{R}^{d_Y}\right) \to \mathbb{R} \text{ such that } \overline{\theta}_t^{\varphi}\left(\boldsymbol{Y}|_{[0,t]}\right) = \pi_t(\varphi) \ \ \mathbb{P}-a.s$$

here $\boldsymbol{Y}$ is the canonical rough path lift of the semimartingale Y. The argument in [7] relies on an observation of Mark Davis [8], namely that under an appropiate change of measure the observation Y is a Brownian motion independent of B, the signal satisfies the SDE

$$dX_t = \overline{l}_0(X_t, Y_t)\,dt + \sum_k Z_k(X_t, Y_t)\,dY_t^k + \sum_j L_j(X_t, Y_t)\,d\overline{B}_t^j \tag{4.3}$$

where $\overline{l}_0 = l_0 + \sum_k Z_k h_k$ and that the robustness question is linked to the (rough pathwise) robustness of $Y \mapsto X$. To treat the resulting differential equation driven by Brownian noise B and a rough path (instead of Y) a flow decomposition is used in [7]. We can now replace this argument by Theorem 6 and Theorem 7 which leads to different regularity assumptions on the vector fields.

Theorem 8. *Let* $\varphi \in Lip^1$ *and let* $\gamma > \frac{1}{\alpha}$ *for some* $\alpha \in \left(\frac{1}{3}, \frac{1}{2}\right)$ *and*

$$l_0 \in Lip^{1+\epsilon}, \ \ h, Z, L \in Lip^{\gamma}$$

for some $\epsilon > 0$. *Denote with* (X, Y) *be the solution of (4.1). Then there exists a continuous map*

$$\theta : \left(\mathcal{C}^{0,\alpha}, \rho_\alpha\right) \to (\mathbb{R}, |.|)$$

such that

$$\theta(\boldsymbol{Y}) = \mathbb{E}\left[\varphi(X_t)\,|\sigma(Y_r, r \in [0,t])\right] \ \ \mathbb{P}-a.s.$$

where $\boldsymbol{Y}$ *denotes the Stratonovich lift of the semimartingale* Y *to a geometric rough path.*

Proof. To switch the equation (4.3) to the Stratonovich formulation define

$$\begin{aligned} L_0^j(x,y) &= \overline{l}_0^j - \frac{1}{2}\sum_k \sum_i \partial_{x^i} Z_k^j(x,y)\, Z_k^i(x,y) - \frac{1}{2}\sum_k \partial_{y^k} Z_k^j(x,y) \\ & -\frac{1}{2}\sum_k \sum_i \partial_{x^i} L_k^j(x,y)\, L_k^i(x,y) - \frac{1}{2}\sum_k \partial_{y^k} L_k^j(x,y). \end{aligned}$$

---

[7] The functional ϕ_t^{φ} is only uniquely defined up to nullsets on pathspace but only discrete observations of Y are available; further the model choosen for the observation process might only be close in law to the "real-world" observation process.

By Theorem 6,

$$\begin{aligned} dX_t^{\boldsymbol{\eta}} &= L_0\left(X_t^{\boldsymbol{\eta}},Y_t^{\boldsymbol{\eta}}\right)dt + Z\left(X_t^{\boldsymbol{\eta}},Y_t^{\boldsymbol{\eta}}\right)d\boldsymbol{\eta}_t + \sum_j L_j\left(X_t^{\boldsymbol{\eta}},Y_t^{\boldsymbol{\eta}}\right)\circ d\overline{B}_t^j \\ dY_t^{\boldsymbol{\eta}} &= d\boldsymbol{\eta}_t \\ dI_t^{\boldsymbol{\eta}} &= h\left(X_t^{\boldsymbol{\eta}},Y_t^{\boldsymbol{\eta}}\right)d\boldsymbol{\eta}_t - \frac{1}{2}D_k h\left(X_t^{\boldsymbol{\eta}},Y_t^{\boldsymbol{\eta}}\right)dt \end{aligned}$$

has unique solution $\left(X_t^{\boldsymbol{\eta}},Y_t^{\boldsymbol{\eta}},I_t^{\boldsymbol{\eta}}\right)\in\mathcal{S}^2$ and following the proof of [7, Theorem 6] shows continuity of θ (for these steps it is important to have $\mathbb{E}\left[\exp\left(qI_t^{\boldsymbol{\eta}}\right)\right]<\infty$ for $q\geq 2$ as guaranteed by Theorem 6). Similarly, we can follow step-by-step [7, Theorem 7] to show the consistency $\theta\left(\boldsymbol{Y}\right)=\pi_t\left(\varphi\right)$ $\mathbb{P}-a.s.$ □

Remark 9. The regularity assumption in [7] is $h,Z\in Lip^{4+\epsilon}$,$L\in Lip^1$, i.e. above approach allows to relax the regularity of the sensor function h and Z by two degrees of regularity for the price of an additional degree of regularity of $L=\left(L_i\right)_{i=1}^d$.

4.2. **Feynmac–Kac representation for linear RPDEs.** Over the last years there has been an increased interest in giving a (rough) pathwise meaning to stochastic partial differential equations and several approaches have emerged. We mention the work of Gubinelli et al. [9, 17], Hairer et al. [18, 19] and Teichmann [28]. The approach we focus on in this section is related to the work of Lions and Souganidis [22] and Friz et al. [2, 3, 11, 10]. In a setting similar to the one in [11] we are able, using rough SDEs, to prove existence and uniqueness of solutions under weaker assumptions on the coefficients and give a stochastic representation for the solution.

Definition 10. Let $\boldsymbol{\eta}\in\mathcal{C}^{0,\alpha}\left(\mathbb{R}^d\right)$ be a geometric rough path for some $\alpha\in(0,1]$ and $\sigma:\mathbb{R}^m\to\mathbb{R}^{m'}$, $a:\mathbb{R}^m\to\mathbb{R}^m$, $G_i:\mathbb{R}^m\times\mathbb{R}\times\mathbb{R}^m\to\mathbb{R}$ and $\phi:\mathbb{R}^m\to\mathbb{R}$ be such that for every $\eta\in C^1\left([0,T],\mathbb{R}^d\right)$ there exists a unique bounded, uniformly continuous, viscosity solution $v^\eta:[0,T]\times\mathbb{R}^m\to\mathbb{R}$ to

$$-\partial_t v^\eta - L\left(x,Dv^\eta,D^2v^\eta\right) - \sum_{i=1}^d G_i\left(x,v^\eta,Dv^\eta\right)\dot{\eta}_t^i = 0,$$
$$v^\eta\left(T,x\right)=\phi\left(x\right)$$

where

$$L:\mathbb{R}^m\times\mathbb{R}^m\times\mathbb{S}^m\to\mathbb{R}\text{ is given as }L\left(x,p,M\right):=Tr\left[\sigma\left(x\right)\sigma^T\left(x\right)M\right]+a\left(x\right)\cdot p.$$

We then say that a bounded, uniformly continuous function $v:[0,T]\times\mathbb{R}^m\to\mathbb{R}$ is a solution of the rough partial differential equation (RPDE)

$$-dv - L\left(x,Dv,D^2v\right)dt - G\left(x,v,Dv\right)d\boldsymbol{\eta}_t = 0,$$
$$v\left(T,x\right)=\phi\left(x\right),$$

(with $G = (G_1, \ldots, G_d)$), if for every sequence of smooth paths $(\eta^n)_n \subset C^1\left([0,T], \mathbb{R}^d\right)$ such that $\eta^n \to \boldsymbol{\eta}$ as $n \to \infty$ in rough path metric we have in locally uniform convergence

$$v^{\eta^n} \to v \text{ as } n \to \infty.$$

Remark 11. Of course above definition is only of use if one can show the existence of a solution for an interesting family of (L, G, ϕ) in the above sense (uniqueness is built into the definition by the uniqueness of the approximating solutions). This is still an area of active research but we mention that for example if G is affine linear there exists a solution in above sense (via the method of characteristics; see [21, 4, 13]). The theorem below shows the existence of such a solution and gives a Feynman–Kac representation via RSDEs as introduced in Section 3. This finally leads to lower regularity assumptions on the noise vector fields (however, in contrast to [21, 4, 13] it only applies to linear operators L).

Theorem 12. *Let $\boldsymbol{\eta} \in \mathcal{C}^{0,\alpha}$ be a geometric rough path, $\alpha \in (0,1]$. Assume $\gamma > \frac{1}{\alpha}$, $\sigma, c \in Lip^{\gamma}$, $\zeta > 1$, $a \in Lip^{\zeta}$. Assume ϕ is bounded and uniformly continuous. Then, there exists a unique solution to the RPDE*

$$\begin{aligned} -dv - L\left(x, v, Dv, D^2 v\right) dt - c(x) \cdot Dv d\boldsymbol{\eta}_t &= 0, \\ v(T,x) &= \phi(x), \end{aligned}$$

Moreover $v(t,x) = \mathbb{E}\left[\phi\left(S_T^{t,x}\right)\right]$ where $S^{s,x}$ denotes the solution of the RSDE

$$\begin{aligned} dS_t^{s,x} &= a\left(S_t^{s,x}\right) dt + \sigma\left(S_t^{s,x}\right) dB_t + c\left(S_t^{s,x}\right) d\boldsymbol{\eta}_t, \\ S_s^{s,x} &= x. \end{aligned}$$

Proof. Let $(\eta^n)_n$ be a sequence of smooths paths converging to $\boldsymbol{\eta}$ in rough path topology. For every fixed n we have the Feynman–Kac representation (see e.g. [27, Theorem 4.13])

$$v^n(t,x) = \mathbb{E}\left[\phi\left(S_T^{n,t,x}\right)\right],$$

where v^n is the unique, bounded viscosity solution to

$$\begin{aligned} -dv^n - L\left(x, v^n, Dv^n, D^2 v^n\right) dt - c(x) \cdot Dv^n d\eta_t^n &= 0, \\ v^n(T,x) &= \phi(x), \end{aligned}$$

and $S^{n,s,x}$ solves the standard SDE

$$\begin{aligned} dS_t^{n,s,x} &= a\left(S_t^{n,s,x}\right) dt + \sigma\left(S_t^{n,s,x}\right) dB_t + c\left(S_t^{n,s,x}\right) d\eta_t^n, \\ S_s^{n,s,x} &= x. \end{aligned}$$

Theorem 6 and Theorem 7 now give the pointwise convergence

$$v^n(t,x) = \mathbb{E}\left[\phi\left(S_T^{n,t,x}\right)\right] \to_{n\to\infty} \mathbb{E}\left[\phi\left(S_T^{t,x}\right)\right] =: v(t,x).$$

To get locally uniform convergence, it suffices to show local equicontinuity of $(v^n)_n$ (by the Arzelà–Ascoli theorem). By the same arguments as in Theorem 6 one sees that a rough

SDE is also locally uniformly continuous in the initial condition S_0, uniformly over $\boldsymbol{\eta}$ in bounded sets. Moreoever, it is straightforward to show, that for every $q \geq 1$

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\left\|\boldsymbol{\Lambda}^{\boldsymbol{\eta}}\right\|_{p;[0,t]}^{q}\right] = o\left(1\right) \text{ as } t \to 0,$$

locally uniformly for $\boldsymbol{\eta}$. Putting the above together yields the local equicontinuity of the $\left(v^n\right)_n$. □

Remark 13. Theorem 12 can be easily extended to cover equations of the type

$$\begin{aligned} -dv - L\left(t,x,v,Dv,D^2v\right)dt - G\left(t,x,u,Du\right)d\boldsymbol{\eta}_t &= 0, \\ v\left(T,x\right) &= \phi\left(x\right), \end{aligned}$$

where G is affine linear in (u, Du) (as in [11]). For brevity we only treat the gradient case. Further note, that we only assume $c \in Lip^{\gamma}$ in contrast to $Lip^{\gamma+2}$ as in [4, 11] where a flow decomposition is used.

5. Appendix

Lemma 14. *Let* $\boldsymbol{\eta}, \bar{\boldsymbol{\eta}} \in \mathcal{C}^{0,\alpha}$*, with corresponding lifts (as in the proof of Theorem 6)* $\boldsymbol{\Lambda}^{\boldsymbol{\eta}}, \boldsymbol{\Lambda}^{\bar{\boldsymbol{\eta}}}$*. Let* $\left\|\boldsymbol{\eta}\right\|_{\alpha}, \left\|\bar{\boldsymbol{\eta}}\right\|_{\alpha} < r$*. Let* $c > 0$*. Let* $\alpha' < \alpha$ *with* $\gamma > \frac{1}{\alpha'}$ *and let* $p' := \frac{1}{\alpha'}$*. Define*

$$\begin{aligned} V\left(s,t\right) &:= \left\|\boldsymbol{\Lambda}^{\boldsymbol{\eta}}\right\|_{p'-var;[s,t]}^{p'} + \left\|\boldsymbol{\Lambda}^{\bar{\boldsymbol{\eta}}}\right\|_{p'-var;[s,t]}^{p'}, \\ N\left(x,y\right) &:= \left\lceil f\left(x,y\right) \sup_{V\left(t_i,t_{i+1}\right) \leq f\left(x,y\right)^{-1}} \sum_i V\left(t_i,t_{i+1}\right) \right\rceil, \end{aligned}$$

where

$$f\left(x,y\right) := \frac{y^{p'}}{\psi^{-1}\left(x\right)^{p}} \text{ and } \psi\left(x\right) := x\exp\left(x\right).$$

For every $q \geq 1$ *there exists* $\beta_0 = \beta_0\left(r,c,q\right) > 0, k = k\left(r,c,q\right) > 0$ *such that for* $\beta < \beta_0$

$$\left|\exp\left(-N\left(\beta,c\right)\log\left(1-\beta\right)\right)\right|_{L^q(\Omega;\mathbb{R})} \leq k.$$

Proof. Define

$$M\left(\beta,c\right) := \sup\left\{n : \tau_1\left(f\left(\beta,c\right)^{-1}\right) + \cdots + \tau_n\left(f\left(\beta,c\right)^{-1}\right) \leq T\right\},$$

where

$$\tau_0\left(a\right) := 0 \text{ and } \tau_{i+1}\left(a\right) := \inf\left\{t \geq 0 : V\left(\sigma_i\left(a\right), \sigma_i\left(a\right)+t\right) \geq a\right\}$$

(with the convention $\inf\emptyset = \infty$ and $\infty - \infty = \infty$) and $\sigma_i\left(a\right) := \sum_{j=1}^{i}\tau_j\left(a\right)$. By the same argument as in [5, Proposition 4.6] one sees that $N\left(\beta,c\right) \leq 2M\left(\beta,c\right)+1$ so it is enough to estimate the tails of M. We estimate

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}\left[M\left(\beta,c\right) > n\right] &= \mathbb{P}\left[\tau_1\left(f\left(\beta,c\right)^{-1}\right) + \cdots + \tau_n\left(f\left(\beta,c\right)^{-1}\right) \leq T\right] \\ &\leq \mathbb{P}\left[\tau_1\left(f\left(\beta,c\right)^{-1}\right) \wedge \phi\left(\beta\right) + \cdots + \tau_n\left(f\left(\beta,c\right)^{-1}\right) \wedge \phi\left(\beta\right) \leq T\right], \end{aligned}$$

where we take ϕ to be the function given in Lemma 15. Define

$$m_i := m_i(\beta) := \mathbb{E}\left[\tau_i\left(f(\beta,c)^{-1}\right)\wedge\phi(\beta)\right] \text{ and } \bar{S}_n := \frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^{n}\left[\tau_i\left(f(\beta,c)^{-1}\right)\wedge\phi(\beta) - m_i\right]$$

and write $\mathbb{P}[M(\beta,c)>n] \le \mathbb{P}\left[\bar{S}_n \le \frac{T}{n} - \frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^{n} m_i\right]$. Now Lemma 15 shows, that $0 < m(\beta) \le \frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^{n} m_i$ for all n, where $m(\beta) := \frac{\phi(\beta)}{2}$. Then for all $n \ge n_0(T,\beta) := \frac{2T}{m(\beta)}$,

$$\mathbb{P}[M(\beta,c)>n] \le \mathbb{P}\left[\bar{S}_n \le -\frac{1}{2}m(\beta)\right].$$

For brevity, denote $\varepsilon_0 := \frac{1}{2}m(\beta)$. We use Hoeffding's inequality, [20, Theorem 2], to arrive at

$$\mathbb{P}[M(\beta,c)>n] \le \mathbb{P}\left[\bar{S}_n \le -\frac{1}{2}m(\beta)\right] = \mathbb{P}\left[\bar{S}_n \le -\varepsilon_0\right] \le 2\exp\left(-\frac{2\varepsilon_0^2 n^2}{n\phi(\beta)^2}\right). \tag{5.1}$$

Now

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\exp\left(-q\log(1-\beta)M(\beta,c)\right)\right] \le \sum_{n=1}^{\infty}\mathbb{P}\left[M(\beta,c) \ge \left\lfloor\frac{\log n}{q(-\log(1-\beta))}\right\rfloor\right]$$

For $n \ge n_1 := \exp\left((n_0+1)(-\log(1-\beta))q\right)$ one has by (5.1) that

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{P}\left[M(\beta,c) \ge \left\lfloor\frac{\log n}{q(-\log(1-\beta))}\right\rfloor\right] &\le 2\exp\left(-\frac{2\varepsilon_0^2}{\phi(\beta)^2}\left\lfloor\frac{\log n}{q(-\log(1-\beta))}\right\rfloor\right)\\
&\le 2\exp\left(\frac{2\varepsilon_0^2}{\phi(\beta)^2}\right)\exp\left(-\frac{2\varepsilon_0^2}{\phi(\beta)^2}\frac{\log n}{q(-\log(1-\beta))}\right)\\
&= 2\exp\left(\frac{2\varepsilon_0^2}{\phi(\beta)^2}\right)n^{-\frac{2\varepsilon_0^2}{\phi(\beta)^2 q(-\log(1-\beta))}}\\
&= 2\exp\left(\frac{1}{4}\right)n^{-\frac{1}{4q(-\log(1-\beta))}}
\end{aligned}$$

Finally, pick $\beta_0 = \beta_0(q)$ such that $\frac{1}{4q(-\log(1-\beta))} \ge 2$ for $\beta \le \beta_0$. Then for $\beta \le \beta_0$

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\exp\left(-q\log(1-\beta)M(\beta,c)\right)\right] \le n_1(\beta) + 2\exp\left(\frac{1}{4}\right)\zeta(2),$$

and $n_1(\beta)$ is bounded for $\|\boldsymbol{\eta}\|_{\alpha-H\ddot{o}l}, \|\bar{\boldsymbol{\eta}}\|_{\alpha-H\ddot{o}l}$ bounded, by Lemma 15. This finishes the proof. □

Lemma 15. *Let $\boldsymbol{\eta}, \bar{\boldsymbol{\eta}} \in \mathcal{C}^{0,\alpha}$, with corresponding lifts (as in Theorem 6) $\boldsymbol{\Lambda}^{\boldsymbol{\eta}}, \boldsymbol{\Lambda}^{\bar{\boldsymbol{\eta}}}$. Then there exists a function $\phi = \phi(\boldsymbol{\eta}, \bar{\boldsymbol{\eta}}) : \mathbb{R}_+ \to \mathbb{R}_+$, such that $\phi(x) > 0$ for $x \neq 0$ such that for all $n \ge 1$*

$$\frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}\mathbb{E}\left[\tau_i\left(f(\beta,c)^{-1}\right)\wedge\phi(\beta)\right] \ge \frac{\phi(\beta)}{2}.$$

Proof. For every $i \geq 1$

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}\left[\tau_i\left(f\left(\beta,c\right)^{-1}\right)\wedge\phi\left(\beta\right)\right] &\geq \mathbb{P}\left[\tau_i\left(f\left(\beta,c\right)^{-1}\right)\geq\phi\left(\beta\right)\right]\cdot\phi\left(\beta\right)\\ &= \Big(1-\mathbb{P}\left[\tau_i\left(f\left(\beta,c\right)^{-1}\right)<\phi\left(\beta\right)\right]\Big)\cdot\phi\left(\beta\right)\\ &\geq \Big(1-\mathbb{P}\left[\tau_i\left(f\left(\beta,c\right)^{-1}\right)\leq\phi\left(\beta\right)\right]\Big)\cdot\phi\left(\beta\right)\\ &= \left(1-\mathbb{P}\left[V\left(\left(\sigma_i\left(f\left(\beta,c\right)\right)^{-1}\right),\sigma_i\left(f\left(\beta,c\right)^{-1}\right)+\phi\left(\beta\right)\right)\geq f\left(\beta,c\right)^{-1}\right]\right)\cdot\phi\left(\beta\right).\end{aligned}$$

Now, by Markov inequality,

$$\begin{aligned}&\mathbb{P}\left[V\left(\sigma_i\left(f\left(\beta,c\right)^{-1}\right),\sigma_i\left(f\left(\beta,c\right)^{-1}\right)+\phi\left(\beta\right)\right)\geq f\left(\beta,c\right)^{-1}\right]\\ \leq\ & f\left(\beta,c\right)\mathbb{E}\left[V\left(\sigma_i\left(f\left(\beta,c\right)^{-1}\right),\sigma_i\left(f\left(\beta,c\right)^{-1}\right)+\phi\left(\beta\right)\right)\right].\end{aligned}$$

Hence

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\tau_i\left(f\left(\beta,c\right)^{-1}\right)\wedge\phi\left(\beta\right)\right]\geq\Big(1-f\left(\beta,c\right)\mathbb{E}\left[V\left(\sigma_i\left(f\left(\beta,c\right)^{-1}\right),\sigma_i\left(f\left(\beta,c\right)^{-1}\right)+\phi\left(\beta\right)\right)\right]\Big)\cdot\phi\left(\beta\right).$$

Summing up we get

$$\begin{aligned}&\frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}\mathbb{E}\left[\tau_i\left(f\left(\beta,c\right)^{-1}\right)\wedge\phi\left(\beta\right)\right]\\ \geq\ & \frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^{n}\Big(1-f\left(\beta,C\right)\mathbb{E}\left[V\left(\sigma_i\left(f\left(\beta,c\right)^{-1}\right),\sigma_i\left(f\left(\beta,c\right)^{-1}\right)+\phi\left(\beta\right)\right)\right]\Big)\cdot\phi\left(\beta\right)\\ =\ & \Big(1-f\left(\beta,c\right)\frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^{n}\mathbb{E}\left[V\left(\sigma_i\left(f\left(\beta,c\right)^{-1}\right),\sigma_i\left(f\left(\beta,c\right)^{-1}\right)+\phi\left(\beta\right)\right)\right]\Big)\cdot\phi\left(\beta\right). \qquad (5.2)\end{aligned}$$

Now

$$\begin{aligned}&\Big(1-f\left(\beta,c\right)\frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^{n}\mathbb{E}\left[V\left(\sigma_i\left(f\left(\beta,c\right)^{-1}\right),\sigma_i\left(f\left(\beta,c\right)^{-1}\right)+\phi\left(\beta\right)\right)\right]\\ \geq\ & \Big(1-f\left(\beta,c\right)\sup_{\tau}\mathbb{E}\left[V\left(\tau,\tau+\phi\left(\beta\right)\right)\right]\Big),\end{aligned}$$

where the supremum is over all stopping times τ. We define

$$\phi\left(\beta\right):=\frac{1}{2}\sup\left\{a:\sup_{\tau}\mathbb{E}\left[V\left(\tau,\tau+a\right)\right]\leq\frac{1}{2f\left(\beta,c\right)}\right\}.$$

and claim that $\phi>0$ for $\beta>0$. Indeed, note that

$$\begin{aligned}\sup_{\tau}\mathbb{E}\left[V\left(\tau,\tau+a\right)\right] &= \sup_{\tau}\mathbb{E}\left[\left\|\mathbf{\Lambda}^{\boldsymbol{\eta}}\right\|_{p'-var;[\tau,\tau+a]}^{p'}+\left\|\mathbf{\Lambda}^{\overline{\boldsymbol{\eta}}}\right\|_{p'-var;[\tau,\tau+a]}^{p'}\right]\\ &\leq \sup_{\tau}\mathbb{E}\left[a\left\|\mathbf{\Lambda}^{\boldsymbol{\eta}}\right\|_{\alpha'-H\ddot{o}l;[0,T]}^{p'}+a\left\|\mathbf{\Lambda}^{\overline{\boldsymbol{\eta}}}\right\|_{\alpha'-H\ddot{o}l;[0,T]}^{p'}\right]\\ &= \mathbb{E}\left[\left\|\mathbf{\Lambda}^{\boldsymbol{\eta}}\right\|_{\alpha'-H\ddot{o}l;[0,T]}^{p'}+\left\|\mathbf{\Lambda}^{\overline{\boldsymbol{\eta}}}\right\|_{\alpha'-H\ddot{o}l;[0,T]}^{p'}\right]a,\end{aligned}$$

which shows that $\phi(\beta) > 0$ for $\beta > 0$. By construction of $\mathbf{\Lambda}$ we have in particular that $\phi(\beta)$ is bounded away from 0 for $\|\boldsymbol{\eta}\|_{\alpha-H\ddot{o}l}, \|\overline{\boldsymbol{\eta}}\|_{\alpha-H\ddot{o}l}$ bounded. Then by (5.2)

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}\mathbb{E}\left[\tau_i\left(f(\beta,c)^{-1}\right)\wedge\phi(\beta)\right] &\geq \Big(1-f(\beta,c)\sup_{\tau}\mathbb{E}\left[V(\tau,\tau+\phi(\beta))\right]\Big)\cdot\phi(\beta)\\ &\geq \frac{1}{2}\phi(\beta),\end{aligned}$$

and this concludes the proof. □

References

[1] V. I. Bogachev. *Measure theory. Vol. I.* Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2007.

[2] M. Caruana and P. Friz. Partial differential equations driven by rough paths. *Journal of Differential Equations*, 247(1):140–173, 2009.

[3] M. Caruana, P.K. Friz, and H. Oberhauser. A (rough) pathwise approach to a class of non-linear stochastic partial differential equations. In *Annales de l'Institut Henri Poincare (C) Non Linear Analysis*, volume 28, pages 27–46. Elsevier, 2011.

[4] Michael Caruana, Peter Friz, and Harald Oberhauser. A (rough) pathwise approach to a class of nonlinear stochastic partial differential equations. *Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré Anal. Non Linéaire*, 28(1):27–46, 2011.

[5] T. Cass, C. Litterer, and T. Lyons. Integrability estimates for gaussian rough differential equations. *Arxiv preprint arXiv:1104.1813*, 2011.

[6] T. Cass and T. Lyons. Interacting communities with individual preferences. *Working paper*, 2012.

[7] Dan Crisan, Joscha Diehl, Peter Friz, and Harald Oberhauser. Robust filtering: multdimensional noise and multidimensional observation. *Annals of Applied Probability (in press)*, 2012.

[8] Mark Davis. Pathwise nonlinear filtering with noise correlation. In Dan Crisan and Boris Rozovskiĭ, editors, *Oxford Handbook of Nonlinear Filtering*. Oxford University Press, 2010.

[9] A. Deya, M. Gubinelli, and S. Tindel. Non-linear rough heat equations. *Probability Theory and Related Fields*, pages 1–51, 2011.

[10] J. Diehl and P. Friz. Backward stochastic differential equations with rough drivers. *The Annals of Probability*, 40(4):1715–1758, 2012.

[11] P. Friz and H. Oberhauser. Rough path stability of (semi-)linear spdes. *Probability Theory and Related fields*, in press.

[12] Peter Friz and Harald Oberhauser. A generalized Fernique theorem and applications. *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 138(10):3679–3688, 2010.

[13] Peter Friz and Harald Oberhauser. Rough path stability of (semi-)linear SPDEs. *Probability Theory and Related Fields (in press)*, 2011.

[14] Peter Friz and Nicolas Victoir. A note on the notion of geometric rough paths. *Probab. Theory Related Fields*, 136(3):395–416, 2006.

[15] Peter K. Friz and Nicolas B. Victoir. *Multidimensional stochastic processes as rough paths: theory and applications*. Cambridge Studies in Advanced Mathematics. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2010.

[16] M. Gubinelli. Controlling rough paths. *J. Funct. Anal.*, 216(1):86–140, 2004.

[17] M. Gubinelli, A. Lejay, and S. Tindel. Young integrals and spdes. *Potential Analysis*, 25(4):307–326, 2006.

[18] M. Hairer. Rough stochastic pdes. *Communications on Pure and Applied Mathematics*, 64(11):1547–1585, 2011.

[19] M. Hairer. Solving the KPZ equation. *Annals of Mathematics*, 2012.

[20] W. Hoeffding. Probability inequalities for sums of bounded random variables. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, pages 13–30, 1963.

[21] Pierre-Louis Lions and Panagiotis E. Souganidis. Fully nonlinear stochastic pde with semilinear stochastic dependence. *C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris Sér. I Math.*, 331(8):617–624, 2000.

[22] P.L. Lions and P.E. Souganidis. Fully nonlinear stochastic partial differential equations. *Comptes Rendus de l'Académie des Sciences-Series I-Mathematics*, 326(9):1085–1092, 1998.

[23] Terry Lyons. Differential equations driven by rough signals. *Rev. Mat. Iberoamericana*, 14(2):215–310, 1998.

[24] Terry Lyons and Zhongmin Qian. *System Control and Rough Paths*. Oxford University Press, 2002. Oxford Mathematical Monographs.

[25] Terry Lyons and Nicolas Victoir. An extension theorem to rough paths. *Annales de l'Institut Henri Poincare (C) Non Linear Analysis*, 24(5):835 – 847, 2007.

[26] Terry J. Lyons, Michael Caruana, and Thierry Lévy. Differential equations driven by rough paths, 2007. Lectures from the 34th Summer School on Probability Theory held in Saint-Flour, July 6–24, 2004, With an introduction concerning the Summer School by Jean Picard.

[27] E. Pardoux and S. Peng. Backward stochastic differential equations and quasilinear parabolic partial differential equations. *Stochastic partial differential equations and their applications*, pages 200–217, 1992.

[28] J. Teichmann. Another approach to some rough and stochastic partial differential equations. *Stochastics and Dynamics*, 11(02n03):535–550, 2011.

TU Berlin, Institut für Mathematik, Strasse des 17. Juni 136, 10623 Berlin
E-mail address: `diehl@math.tu-berlin.de` and `h.oberhauser@gmail.com`